UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,730	04/02/2004	James L. Hartley	IVGN 192.3 CON 2	1581

65482 7590 07/13/2007

INVITROGEN CORPORATION
C/O INTELLEVATE
P.O. BOX 52050
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER	
VOGEL, NANCY S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1636	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/13/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/815,730	HARTLEY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nancy T. Vogel	1636	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 April 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *19-37* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *19-37* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 19-37 are pending in the case.

Any rejection of record in the previous action not addressed in this office action is withdrawn. There are no new grounds of rejection that were not necessitated by applicants' amendment and therefore, this action is final.

Priority

Applicant's claim for the benefit of a prior-filed application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c) is acknowledged. Applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 120 as follows:

The later-filed application must be an application for a patent for an invention which is also disclosed in the prior application (the parent or original nonprovisional application or provisional application). The disclosure of the invention in the parent application and in the later-filed application must be sufficient to comply with the requirements of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112. See *Transco Products, Inc. v. Performance Contracting, Inc.*, 38 F.3d 551, 32 USPQ2d 1077 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

The disclosure of the prior-filed application, Application No. 09/432,085, fails to provide adequate support or enablement in the manner provided by the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 for one or more claims of this application. The prior application does not disclose a negative selection marker and an antibiotic selection marker between a third and fourth recombination sited on a vector, with which an amplification production

comprising a first and second recombination site is to be recombined. Priority date of 10/24/1997 is therefore utilized.

The following are new rejections necessitated by applicant's amendments to the claims filed 4/25/07:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 19-30, 32-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al. (WO93/ Johnson et al. (WO93/19172) (AO3, cited by applicants). Johnson et al. disclose a method of cloning an amplification product comprising obtaining an amplification product comprising a first recombination site and a second recombination site which do not recombine with each other; and combining said product with a vector comprising a third recombination site and a fourth recombination site which do not recombine with each other, under conditions such that recombination occurs between said first and third and second and fourth recombination sites, thereby producing a product vector (see pages 21-23). At page 22, line 31 – page 23, line 12, it is disclosed that different site specific recombination sites may be used in the first vector, as well as in the second vector, such that there will not be recombination between said sites within each vector, but that each vector has a recombination site that

recombines with a site on the other vector. The reference discloses that the method may be carried out in vitro (see page 21, lines 9-11; see claims). The reference discloses that the first site may be the loxP site, and the second may be the loxP 511 site (page 23, lines 13-22) or attB, attP, attL, attR. The recombinase protein may be Cre, Int, IHF (see pages 29-33). The reference discloses that the vector is an expression vector comprising promoter, origin of replication, selectable marker, and genes (see page 20-23). Johnson et al. disclose the use of markers on the plasmids which are being subject to site specific recombination for the purpose of selection of desirable outcomes (see Figures).

The difference between the reference and the claims is that a negative selection marker and an antibiotic resistance gene are present on the vector.

However, the use of antibiotic resistance and negative selection markers on plasmids is well known in the art, as taught by Bernard (Biotechniques 21(2):320-323). Bernard et al. teach the use of a negative selective marker such as ccdB for selection of desired DNA molecules.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have utilized antibiotic resistance genes and negative selection markers such as ccdB in the recombination process of Johnson et al., since it was well known in the art to include such selection markers in DNA molecules in order to select for the presence or absence of a DNA molecule of interest, as taught by Bernard. One would have been motivated to do so by the desire to increase the ability to select for a DNA molecule of interest.

Claims 19-30, 32-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Griffiths et al. (US Patent No. 5,962,255).

Griffiths et al teach a method for cloning an amplified linear nucleic acid by amplifying a nucleic acid template with a first primer comprising a first recombination site and second primer comprising a second recombination site, where the first and second recombination sites do not recombine with each other. The vector comprises third and fourth recombination sites which will recombine with the first and second recombination sites, as recited in the instant claim 1 (see Griffiths at Example 6-7, see claims). Recombining the amplified nucleic acid and a vector in the presence of a recombination protein produces a recombined vector (product vector). The amplification is accomplished by an amplification reaction, which may be via replication in a host cell. The recombined (product) vector is expressed in a host cell. The vector comprises a promoter, a restriction site, an origin of replication, a cloning site and a gene. The product nucleic acid is linear. The first, second, third or fourth recombination sites are lox sites or mutants thereof (loxP and loxP511). The recombination sites may be lox or att sites (see Griffiths et al, column 19 and Example 6 and claims). The product nucleic acid molecule and said vector are combined in the presence of at least one recombination protein. The recombinase may be Cre or other recombinases (see col. 19 and 23).

The difference between the reference and the claims is that a negative selection marker and an antibiotic resistance gene are present on the vector.

However, the use of antibiotic resistance and negative selection markers on plasmids is well known in the art, as taught by Bernard (Biotechniques 21(2):320-323). Bernard et al. teach the use of a negative selective marker such as ccdB for selection of desired DNA molecules.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have utilized antibiotic resistance genes and negative selection markers such as ccdB in the recombination process of Johnson et al., since it was well known in the art to include such selection markers in DNA molecules in order to select for the presence or absence of a DNA molecule of interest, as taught by Bernard. One would have been motivated to do so by the desire to increase the ability to select for a DNA molecule of interest.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 19, 22-37 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 29-34, of U.S. Patent No. 5,888,732.

This rejection is maintained essentially for the reasons made of record in the previous Office action. Applicants have stated in the arguments filed 4/24/07 that they wish to defer responding to the rejection until allowable subject matter is determined. Therefore the rejection is maintained.

Claims 19-37 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 15-20 and 45-55 of U.S. Patent No. 6720140.

This rejection is maintained essentially for the reasons made of record in the previous Office action. Applicants have stated in the arguments filed 4/24/07 that they wish to defer responding to the rejection until allowable subject matter is determined. Therefore the rejection is maintained.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nancy T. Vogel whose telephone number is (571) 272-0780. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 - 3:30, Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Woitach can be reached on (571) 272-0739. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

NANCY VOGEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NV
7/5/07

/[illegible] VOGEL/
PRIMARY EXAMINER